

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/643,249
Attorney Docket No. 2102397-992780

REMARKS

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's rejections on the ground that neither *Chang*, *Goetting*, nor *Joo* discloses a user selectable non-volatile memory that stores a user selected protocol or that generates a select signal corresponding to the user selected protocol. Applicant also traverses on the ground that *Goetting* teaches away from the present invention.

Chang

Chang discloses a memory device having automatic protocol detection. With reference to FIG. 2, a protocol detection circuit 210 monitors signals sent to the I/O pins 212 to determine which protocol the host is employing (FIG. 2; Col. 5:44-48). It then sends an enable signal to the appropriate protocol circuit 206, 208 to enable communication according to that protocol (Col. 5:51-55).

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, FIG. 8 of *Chang* does not disclose that its protocol detection circuit 210 contains a user selectable memory. There is no disclosure in *Chang* that any of the signals shown in FIG. 8 are user selectable. In fact, it is known that typical protocol detection circuits such as circuit 210 are simply designed to recognize the initiation of certain commands, and do not contain any user selectable memory. Certainly, no non-volatile user selectable memory is disclosed, as Examiner agrees. Accordingly, *Chang* cannot disclose user selectable non-volatile memory that also stores a user selected protocol, or generates a select signal.

Goetting

Goetting discloses a circuit for programming an output cell of a programmable logic device (PLD). The circuit of *Goetting* commonly employs non-volatile memory such as fuses (Col. 1:10-16). However, the non-volatile memory of *Goetting* only stores logic functions used in operation of the PLD (Col. 1:9-11; Col. 2:30-32; Col. 4:19-21). Accordingly, it does not disclose non-volatile memories configured to store user selected protocols, which are not logic functions. It certainly does not disclose that its memory is capable of generating a select signal

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/643,249
Attorney Docket No. 2102397-992780

corresponding to the user selected protocol. *Goetting* also teaches away from the present invention, in that *Goetting* teaches the storing of elements necessary for operation of a PLD (such as logic functions). It thus teaches away from the storing of information unrelated to PLDs, such as user selected protocols. *Goetting* therefore also teaches away from the generation of select signals corresponding to these protocols.

Joo

Joo discloses a semiconductor memory device with non-volatile fuse ROM arrays 50. Like *Goetting*, the fuse ROM arrays 50 of *Joo* are generic non-volatile memories for controlling general semiconductor memory devices. Accordingly, *Joo* does not disclose non-volatile memory that is user selectable and configured to store a user selected protocol, nor does it disclose that these memories are capable of generating a select signal corresponding to the user selected protocol.

From the above it is clear that, even if *Chang*, *Goetting*, and *Joo* disclose non-volatile memories, none of them discloses a user selectable non-volatile memory that stores a user selected protocol, or one that generates a select signal corresponding to the user selected protocol. In fact, *Goetting* teaches away from such memories. Claim 1 is thus patentable over *Chang*, *Goetting*, and *Joo* for at least the reason that it recites "a user selectable non-volatile memory for storing user selected protocol and for generating the select signal, corresponding to the user selected protocol." Similarly, claim 8 is patentable over *Chang*, *Goetting*, and *Joo* for at least the reason that it recites "a non-volatile fuse for generating the select signal."

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9-10 depend from claim 8. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over *Chang*, *Goetting*, and *Joo* for at least these same reasons.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/643,249
Attorney Docket No. 2102397-992780

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance.


The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to **Deposit Account No. 07-1896**.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: September 22, 2005

By 
Ronald L. Yin
Reg. No. 27,607
Attorney for Applicants

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 833-2437